UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,153	08/20/2003	Takehiro Fukuwaki	NECE 20.585	6502

26304 7590 06/15/2005

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP
575 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585

EXAMINER	
KIM, RICHARD H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2871	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/644,153	FUKUWAKI, TAKEHIRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Richard H. Kim	2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 August 2003 is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cheng et al. (US 2002/0109802 A1).

Referring to claims 1 and 7, Cheng et al. discloses a liquid crystal display device comprising a liquid crystal display unit for display images. and a case having a rigid hollow rectangular cross-section in which the display unit is installed (Fig. 2, ref. 204), the case being formed with an opening through which the display device is slid into and out of the hollow rectangular cross-section of the case (Fig. 2).

Referring to claim 2, Cheng et al. discloses the device wherein the case is formed with a guide for supporting the display unit therein (Fig. 2, ref. 230).

Referring to claim 5, Cheng et al. discloses the device further comprising a base plate on which the display unit is fixed (Fig. 2, ref. 206).

Referring to claim 6, Cheng et al. discloses the device wherein the display device is comprised of an electroluminescence (EL) display device (page 2, line 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 8-10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. in view of Sato (US 6,806,919 B1) and admitted prior art (AAPA).

Referring to claim 8, Cheng et al. discloses the device previously recited, but fails to disclose that the device is comprised of a liquid crystal display panel; a first substrate supplying a desired voltage to the liquid crystal display panel; a second substrate supplying a signal voltage to the first substrate; a backlight unit supplying backlight to the liquid crystal display panel; a third substrate acting as an interface; and a fourth substrate supplying a desired voltage to the backlight unit.

Sato et al. discloses a device comprising a liquid crystal display panel (Fig. 3, ref. 2); first substrate supplying a desired voltage to the liquid crystal display panel (Fig. 3, ref. 4); a second substrate supplying a signal voltage to the first substrate (Fig. 3, ref. 5); a backlight unit

supplying a backlight to the liquid crystal display panel (Fig. 8, ref. 8). AAPA discloses a third substrate acting as an interface (Fig. 8, ref. 26), and a backlight substrate supplying a desired voltage to the backlight unit (Fig. 8, ref. 7).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a liquid crystal display panel; a first substrate supplying a desired voltage to the liquid crystal display panel; a second substrate supplying a signal voltage to the first substrate; a backlight unit supplying backlight to the liquid crystal display panel; a third substrate acting as an interface; and a fourth substrate supplying a desired voltage to the backlight unit since one would be motivated to provide the proper structure needed in order to supply signals to drive and illuminate the liquid crystal display.

Referring to claim 9, Cheng et al. discloses that the base plate is formed centrally with a window through which a display area of the liquid crystal panel is exposed (206), and the based plate is formed with ribs for supporting the liquid crystal display panel (240). However, the reference does not disclose a light-guide and a light-reflector both constituting the backlight unit.

Sato et al. discloses a device comprising a light-guide and a light-reflector both constituting a backlight unit (Fig. 6, ref. 7-9).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a light-guide and a light-reflector both constituting a backlight unit since one would be motivated to provide uniform illumination to the display.

Referring to claim 10, Cheng et al. discloses that the base plate acts as a guide for the liquid crystal display unit to be slid into and out of the case (Fig. 2, ref. 240, 230).

Referring to claim 13, Cheng et al. discloses the device previously recited, but fails to disclose that the liquid crystal panel, the first substrate, the second substrate, the backlight unit, the third substrate and the fourth substrate are stuck on a base plate on which the liquid crystal panel is supported. AAPA

Sato discloses a device wherein the liquid crystal panel (2), the first substrate (4), the second substrate (5) are stuck on the same base plate (1A). AAPA discloses a third substrate (Fig. 8, ref. 26) and a fourth substrate (Fig. 8, ref. 7).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the first substrate, the second substrate, the backlight unit, the third substrate and the fourth substrate stuck on a base plate on which the liquid crystal panel is supported since one would be motivated to properly support the structure of the LCD using substrates for providing power to the display as well as supporting the liquid crystal panel.

5. Claims 3, 4, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. in view of Hsieh et al. (US 6,879,308 B2).

Referring to claims 3 and 12, Cheng et al. disclose the device previously recited, but fails to disclose that the case includes a cover for covering the opening therewith, the cover being formed as part of the case and that the cover is composed as the same material as the case.

Hsieh et al. discloses a device wherein the case includes a cover for covering the opening therewith, the cover being formed as part of the case (20).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a cover for covering the opening therewith, the cover being formed as part of the case since one would be motivated to prevent the liquid crystal from sliding out of the space formed by the frame (col. 4, lines 3-6). Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art for the cover to be composed as the same material as the case since one would be motivated to simplify the fabrication process by minimizing the number of different materials used in the fabrication process.

Referring to claim 4, Cheng et al. and Hsieh et al. discloses the device previously recited. Cheng et al. does not disclose a bendable cover for having a first position in which the cover does not close the opening, and a second position in which the cover closes the opening.

Hsieh et al. discloses a bendable cover for having a first position in which the cover does not close the opening, and a second in which the cover closes the opening (20). As to the recitation that the cover is "bendable", it has been held that the recitation that an element is "capable of" performing a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchinson,* 69 USPQ. 138. When the cover is detached from the frame, the cover is in the first position. When the cover is attached to the frame, the cover is in the second position.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a bendable cover for having a first position in which the cover does not close the opening, and a second position in which the cover closes the opening since one would be motivated to prevent the liquid crystal from sliding out of the space formed by the frame (col. 4, lines 3-6).

Referring to claim 11, Cheng et al. discloses the device previously recited, but fails to disclose that the opening is closed by bending a part of the case.

Hsieh et al. discloses a device wherein the opening is closed by bending a part of the case (20). Hsieh discloses clips on the side of the cover and the frame. In order for the cover to engage the clips, the cover must be subject to bending.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a device wherein the opening is closed by bending a part of the case since one would be motivated to prevent the liquid crystal from sliding out of the space formed by the frame (col. 4, lines 3-6).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard H. Kim whose telephone number is (571)272-2294. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-6:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on (571)272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Richard H Kim
Examiner
Art Unit 2871

RHK

DUNG T. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER